

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,338,639 ("Trout et al") and rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trout et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,544,065 ("Howell et al").

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended and claim 8 has been cancelled, without prejudice. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trout et al. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Trout et al does not recite each and every element set forth in amended claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-15, Trout et al does not anticipate the subject matter recited in those claims.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a ZIF electrical connector having, *inter alia*, a drive means having a first arm for driving the slider, wherein the slider includes a plurality of generally elliptical protrusions, the elliptical protrusions having a long axis that is generally parallel to the first arm. As Trout et al does not disclose, teach or suggest an electrical connector as claimed by the applicant, but rather, has the protrusions at an approximately 45 degree angle to the first arm of the drive means, Trout et al cannot anticipate the ZIF electrical connector disclosed in claim 1. As claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-15 ultimately depend from claim 1, claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-15 are likewise not anticipated by Trout et al. As such, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-11 and 13-15 as being anticipated by Trout et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trout et al in view of Howell et al. Because the combination of Trout et al and Howell et al does not set forth every element of claim 12, the combination of Trout et al and Howell et al does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1. As stated previously in regards to claim 1, Trout et al fails to disclose, teach or suggest the electrical connector claimed in claim 1. Howell et al likewise fails to disclose, teach or suggest the shortcoming of Trout et al. Accordingly,

applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable over Trout et al in view of Howell et al.


Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the amended claims and in light of the above remarks, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: 12/15/06

By: 
Robert J. Zentler
Registration No. 37,973

Mailing Address:
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962